

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Provided herewith is a “Replacement Sheet” for FIG. 6B of the drawings. Kindly note that FIG. 6B has been amended to include reference numbers 10, 20 and 30 for layers #1, #2 and #3, respectively.

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-21 are pending in the above-identified application, wherein Claims 1, 6 and 13 are independent claims. In the Office Action, Claims 1, 2, 6, 7 and 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Chisaka* (US Pat. No.: 5,864,636). Claims 3, 4, 5, 8, 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Chisaka* in view of *Drews et al.* (US Pat. No.: 5,893,126). The Examiner also objected to Claims 5 and 9 because of certain informalities that are corrected, as set forth above, to comply with the recommendations by the Examiner. The Examiner has objected to Claims 11 and 21, but indicated that both would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Independent Claims 1, 6 and 13 have been amended, as set forth above, in order to more clearly and fully distinguish over *Chisaka* and *Drews*.

Independent Claims 1 and 6 have been amended, as set forth above, to incorporate the allowable subject matter of Claim 11. Consequently, *Chisaka* does not anticipate amended independent Claims 1 and 6 and cannot support a 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of same. Thus, it is believed that independent Claims 1 and 6 are in condition for allowance. Claims 2-5, 7-10, and 12 depend from and contain all of the limitations of amended independent Claims 1 and 6. Thus without conceding the patentability of dependent Claims 2-5, 7-10, and 12 *per se*, these claims are believed to be patentably distinguishable over *Chisaka*, based on their respective dependency from amended independent Claims 1 and 6.

Independent Claim 13 has been amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter of Claim 21. Consequently, *Chisaka* does not anticipate amended independent Claim 13 and cannot support a 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of same. Thus, it is believed that amended independent Claim 13 is in condition for allowance. Claims 14-16 and 18-21 depend from and contain all of the limitations of amended independent Claims 13. Thus without conceding the patentability of dependent Claims 14-16 and 18-21, *per se*, these claims are believed to be patentably distinguishable over *Chisaka*, based on their respective dependency from independent Claim 13.

The application containing Claims 1-16 and 18-21 as amended is believed to be in condition for allowance. Claim 17 has been cancelled. Thus, we respectfully request for the withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-21 as well as reconsideration and allowance of the application including Claims 1-21.

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicants

DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP
333 Earle Ovington Boulevard
Uniondale, New York 11553
TEL: (516) 228-8484

PJF/SNB/mk